

Parks Legacy Citizens Committee

Sub Committee: EXISTING PROGRAMS Investment Initiatives

October 6, 2:30 pm

Meeting Notes

Attendees:

Committee members: July Farris (Chair), Michael, Maddux , Brice Maryman, Barbara Wright

Staff attending: Eric Friedli, Michele Finnegan

One citizen attended

TRIAGE:

The committee started by dividing the initiatives into the top 5, middle 5 and bottom 4 and each committee member was asked to discuss whether they thought each initiative need to be moved into a higher or lower group or needed more discussion.

Initiative #	Title	Discussion
TOP Tier		
1	Address Major Maintenance	High priority, needs more discussion
2	Community Center Operations	High priority, needs more discussion
3	Customer Service Technology	Could move down, needs more discussion
4	Regular Park Maintenance	Could move down, needs more discussion
5	Long-Term Facility Maintenance	High priority, needs more discussion
MID Tier		
13	Expand Natural area and GSP Support	Should move much lower on list, Should be able to find other ways to fund this.
21	Improve Youth/Teen Program Delivery	Ok in middle 5
24	Enhance Existing Downtown Parks Maintenance and Activation	OK in middle 5, modest \$'s, not much enthusiasm
20	Expand Special Populations Program capacity	Move to bottom 5
10	Address Property Encroachments	Mixed, needs more discussion
Low Tier		
19	Expand Day Trips and Opportunities for Older Adults	OK in bottom 4
23	Provide for Environmental Education Outreach and Partnerships	OK in bottom 4
6	Eliminate Major Maintenance backlog	Put in Major Maintenance discussion
25	Provide for AthleticField Care and Synthetic Turf Maintenance	OK in botton 4

Five areas for additional discussion were identified:

- Maintenance (#'s 1, 4, 5, 6)
- Customer Service Technology (#3)
- Natural Area Stewardship (#13)
- Encroachments (#10)

- Community Centers (#2)

Maintenance Discussion:

The subcommittee quickly reached consensus that Major Maintenance (#1) is the top priority on everyone's list and is appropriate for a new funding package.

The subcommittee also reached consensus that Regular Palk Maintenance (#4) and Long-term Facility Maintenance (#5) were both essential and basic services and need to be funded. Subcommittee members had a high level of anxiety about the putting these items on a ballot measure and questioned why the general fund is not required to step up and fund them. Members expressed concern that by putting these items on a voter approved funding measure it takes the pressure off the Mayor and City Council to include them in the general fund.

The subcommittee discussed several ways to compel the Mayor and Council to fund these items. These included a matching fund concept where the voter approved funding would not be available unless a certain amount of funding is provided by the general fund. The subcommittee also discussed the idea of a phasing out approach. The voter approved funding would be available at a high level initially but would decrease over time requiring that the general fund would fill in funding as the voter approved funds diminished.

Community Center Discussion:

The discussion on the maintenance items set the stage for a similar discussion about community centers. Through discussion with Michele Finnegan, the subcommittee got a better understanding about the Community Center Investment Initiative and what it is intended to accomplish. The subcommittee suggested the write-up be edited to make it clearer that the Initiative is focused on providing support for opening community centers more hours and activities beyond the open public hours. They also suggested it include more information on scholarships.

The subcommittee reached consensus that this is an essential and basic service and needs to be funded. Subcommittee members had a high level of anxiety about the putting this item on a ballot measure and questioned why the general fund is not required to step up and fund it. The subcommittee came to the same conclusion as it did with the maintenance activities.

Customer Service Technology:

The subcommittee did not view this as an essential service but though it ranks at the bottom of the top. The subcommittee questioned why this would not be funded by fees for the users. The subcommittee suggested staff develop an analysis of what fees and charges might change to support this separate from a voter approved funding source. The subcommittee did express concern about the issues of affordability and the potential impact on low-income users.

While not discussed much by the subcommittee, there seemed an interest in separating the staff support for the website from the scheduling and registration software.

NOTE: Need to reconcile dollar amounts in write-up and prioritization matrix.

Natural Area Stewardship (#13):

The subcommittee did not have consensus on whether this should be in the middle or bottom group. One subcommittee member feels there are other things much more important than this and it should be ranked very low. The subcommittee recognized that this needs to be part of the mix for any voter

approved funding because it has a large constituent group. One subcommittee member stated this is work that needs to be done now because once the opportunity is lost, it is lost forever.

There was discussion about whether this ought to a different funding source such as a utility fee. The reality and timeliness of proposing and gaining adoption of a new tax to funds was questioned by another subcommittee member.

Encroachments (#10):

There was very mixed reviews of this investment initiative. One subcommittee member feels it is a top tier proposal, another put it in the 3rd tier, and the other placed it on the bubble between the 2nd and 3rd tier. The subcommittee agrees the problem needs to be rectified, but was mixed about how it fit into a voter approved funding package.

Other Discussion:

The subcommittee also discussed the issue of supplanting and the term of the funding mechanism

A determination on the length of the funding mechanism may influence how some of the Initiatives are ranked. Some may be more appropriate for short term, such as the items that have a fixed time period. If we are fixing a specific problem then short term would be appropriate. The major maintenance backlog may be in that category. If there is a structural funding problem that is limiting funding for some items then they would be more appropriate for a longer term funding mechanism. Is this a Band-Aid fix or a long term healing?

The overall cost of the measure is also important to the priorities. Want to make sure the essentials are included but don't want to have a measure that is too big for voters. Also need to leave room for some more interesting items to be included.

Need more discussion about Major Maintenance lists.

Don't let the general fund off the hook.